

CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN

OLIVER JOHNSON

AND

GEORGE F. WHITE,

A MINISTER OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS.

With an Appendix.

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY OLIVER JOHNSON,

143 Nassau Street.

1841.

W. S. DORR, PRINTER,
123 Fulton-st.

INTRODUCTION.

I WOULD much sooner commit the following correspondence to the flames than to the press, if the cause of truth and justice did not appear to demand its publication. If there is any force in the reasons which induced me to commence it, they would seem to leave no excuse for withholding it from the public. It was undertaken from no personal or party motive, but for the simple purpose of eliciting THE TRUTH in relation to a serious charge, which I was astonished to learn had been made against members of a Society professing the principles of non-resistance, by a minister of great influence in the Society of Friends in this city.* Of the spirit in which it has been carried on, on *both sides*, I am quite willing that those interested should judge for themselves, without any remarks of mine. It is proper to state, however, that the ministry of George F. White, for some time past, has been characterized by the most violent opposition to the various reformatory associations of the age. The following are some of the epithets which he has often bestowed upon temperance, anti-slavery and non-resistance societies, and upon those who support them, including, of course, many well-known members of the Society of

* As an evidence of his moral and religious standing in the Society, it may be observed, that he is now in possession of the regular certificates of approbation to visit England as a minister.

Friends: "hireling lecturers," "hireling editors and book agents," "servants of the devil," "emissaries of satan," "hypocrites," "blasphemers," "coming up out of the bottomless pit," &c. To those who have heard him, this statement is unnecessary; but I give the fact, without comment, for the information of persons at a distance, into whose hands this correspondence may fall.

The matter embraced in the appendix must speak for itself.

OLIVER JOHNSON.

NEW-YORK, Feb. 10, 1841.

CORRESPONDENCE.

[No. 1.]

Oliver Johnson to George F. White.

143 NASSAU STREET, }
NEW-YORK, NOV. 20, 1840. }

GEORGE F. WHITE:

Respected Friend—Though personally a stranger to you, I shall make no apology for addressing you this note ; nor will I do you the injustice to suppose, that you will require any at my hands, after learning the object I have in view.

I have just been informed, by a highly respectable member of the Society of Friends, who was present on the occasion, that in a public communication to the Rose-street meeting yesterday, you spoke of the Non-Resistance Society as an institution formed “in the will of man ;” and that, in proof of this position, you stated, that on a certain occasion, a company of its members or friends, who had been refused admission to some building, provided themselves with implements for effecting a *forcible* entrance. Whether such an entrance was actually made or not, I am told you did not affirm ; nor is it material, as the *disposition* to commit violence would be sufficiently indicated by the conduct which you described. Now, as I am a member of the Non-Resistance Society,—having assisted in its organization, and signed its Declaration of Sentiments,—and as I am also a member of its Executive Committee, and therefore publicly identified with it, you will not think it strange, that a statement so vitally affect-

ing its reputation, made by a professed minister of the gospel of Peace, in high repute among a large and influential denomination of professing Christians, should excite in my mind emotions of grief and astonishment; especially as I am not acquainted with any circumstances on which such an accusation could rest. Nor will you deem it improper, in these circumstances, that I should call upon you to inform me when and where our Society, or any members or friends of it, were guilty of the conduct which you have attributed to them; or at least to give me the authority on which your statement was made. I take it for granted, that you would not make so grave a charge on mere idle rumor; nor am I willing to suppose that you would be guilty of "bearing false witness" against a class of men who are hated and reviled by the "hireling priests" of the day, and ridiculed and reproached for their adherence to the principles of non-resistance, as taught and exemplified by Him whose minister you profess to be. I therefore ask you, as an act of justice to myself, and to the Society of which I am a member, to give me the information above specified.

Desiring to hear from you at your earliest convenience, I subscribe myself,

Very respectfully, yours,
OLIVER JOHNSON.

GEORGE F. WHITE.

[No. 2.]

George F. White to Oliver Johnson.

NEW-YORK, 11 mo. 20, 1840.

RESPECTED FRIEND:

Thine of this date is at hand, and I reply immediately after its reception, that no person heard me, in a "public communication to the Rose-st. meeting yesterday, (nor the day before, which is probably meant,) speak of the Non-Resistance Society as an institution formed in the will of man."

I knew not until the receipt of thy note, that there was a Non-Resistance Society in this city.

At the time referred to, I asserted, that a man could not, by a mere act of volition, assume and carry out in practice, the principles of non-resistance. I stated that there was a case of recent occurrence, in which *some*, (or, one or more) of a body professing these principles, threatened to make a forcibly entry into a house from which they believed they were unjustly excluded.

I am very confident in the opinion, that I said not more at that time touching that particular case.

I might have added more, but it did not appear to be necessary, as my object was not to censure any man or set of men.

My information was obtained from a person who gave ground, as specified in the deed, *exclusively for the use of the religious Society of Friends*, and had control of the key to a house which had been erected upon it, when the persons above spoken of demanded it: he refused assent until they assured him no lecture would be delivered in the house, as Friends desired the use of it only for an evening's consultation. He afterwards learned, that a regular lecturer, who was in waiting, whose name he gave me, and who was not a member of the Society of Friends, delivered a lecture, in direct violation of the terms upon which the key was obtained.

Thy friend,

GEORGE F. WHITE.

[No. 3.]

Oliver Johnson to George F. White.

143 NASSAU STREET, }
NEW-YORK, Nov. 21, 1840. }

GEORGE F. WHITE:

Respected Friend—Your prompt reply to my letter of yesterday's date is received, from which it appears, that the Friend from whom I derived my information respecting your remarks at the Rose-street meeting, was mistaken in reporting you as having asserted, in terms, that the Non-Resistance Society was formed "in the will of man." This, however, I do not deem material,

since, even if you had said so, it would have been only the expression of an *opinion*, for which you would be accountable to your Divine Master alone.

But, in relation to statements purporting to be matters of *fact*, the person making them is bound, by every principle of honor as a man, and, above all, by his obligations as a Christian, to make the fullest and most unreserved explanations to all whose reputations are liable to suffer in consequence of them. I will not wrong you by supposing, for a moment, that you will question the soundness of this principle, or deny its applicability to the present case. But, I must be permitted to remind you, that your letter does not give me the information which I sought at your hands, and which, on further reflection, I am sure you will not do either me or yourself the injustice to withhold.

By recurring to my note of yesterday, you will perceive that I did not allude to a Non-Resistance Society as existing in this city. I alluded to the New-England Non-Resistance Society, which, I believe, with one exception,* is the only institution of a similar character, or bearing a similar name, in the world, and which, I suppose, was the one to which your remarks had reference. At any rate, you were so understood. If, however, you did not mean to implicate that Society, or any of its members, you owe it no less to yourself than to them, to correct the impression you made. But, there appears to be no reason for the supposition that you were misunderstood on this point, since that Society is the *only* one, so far as I know, that employs a "regular lecturer." I therefore ask you to give me the *name* of the lecturer to whom you refer, and to inform me of the time when, and the place where, the transaction, to which you allude, occurred; in order that, if the highly esteemed agent of our Society shall be found guilty of such disgraceful and unchristian conduct, we may administer Christian reproof, and, in case of his persistence in the wrong, withdraw from him our support and approbation. As the transaction is one to which you have felt yourself at liberty to refer in a solemn religious discourse, I take it for granted

* The Oberlin (Ohio) Non-Resistance Society.

that you cannot object to the most rigid investigation of all the circumstances ; especially when that investigation is sought by those whose characters, as professed disciples of Jesus, and even as honest men, is implicated in the result.

I remain *your* friend,
and the friend of truth,
OLIVER JOHNSON.

[No. 4.]

George F. White to Oliver Johnson.

NEW-YORK, 11 mo. 21, 1840.

OLIVER JOHNSON :

Thy letter of this date states, that the Friend from whom thou derived thy information respecting my remarks at the Rose-street meeting was *mistaken* in reporting me as having asserted, in terms, that the Non-Resistance Society was formed in the will of man ; and that thou dost not deem this part material. Neither do I deem this mistake (if it be a mistake) material. The material part of the misrepresentation of the " highly respectable member of the Society of Friends " is, in 'metamorphosing the word " threatened " into "collecting implements" to make a forcible entry, &c.

When thou shalt furnish me with the name of this " highly respectable member of the Society of Friends," I may give to thy two communications such further attention as I shall think they deserve.

Thy friend,
GEO. F. WHITE.

[No. 5.]

Oliver Johnson to George F. White.

143 NASSAU STREET, }
NEW-YORK, Nov. 21, 1840. }

GEORGE F. WHITE :

Respected Friend—I have not the slightest objection to give you the name of the Friend, from whom I derived the information which induced me to open this cor-

response. It was ————*. I ought, perhaps, in justice to him, to state, that his conversation with me was rather accidental than otherwise, and had no connection, in his mind, with any such step as that which I have felt it my duty to take in the premises : nor has he, that I am aware of, any knowledge of this correspondence.

I endeavored, in my statement of your remarks, to use, as near as my recollection of it would enable me to do, the language used by him. It is quite possible, however, that neither of us was *literally* accurate. That both of us, however, were correct as to every thing *material* to my present purpose, is sufficiently manifest from your own admission of having charged "*some (or one or more) of a body professing non-resistance principles,*" (among whom was a "regular lecturer,") with "*threatening to make a forcible entry*" to a meeting-house. The *threat* is all that is essential, since it could not, of course, have been carried into effect without "implements" † suited to the purpose. I must be allowed, therefore, to express my surprise, that you should *now* make issue upon so immaterial a point, and one, too, which you did not deem worthy of specification in your first note.

Renewing my reasonable request to be immediately furnished with the information sought for in my previous letters, and hoping that your response will comport with the honest frankness and simplicity which should characterize a professed minister of the gospel,

I remain,

Yours, in human brotherhood,

OLIVER JOHNSON.

* The name of this individual is omitted at his own particular request ; the necessity of its publication being entirely obviated by the emphatic admission of George F. White, that "HE IS A MAN OF UNIMPEACHABLE VERACITY." [See p. 16.] The name, however, will be freely communicated to any person who may choose to inquire for it.

† "Materials" is the word in the original. It was used, however, by mistake, and in this, and several other places, I have substituted the word "implements," which was the word used in the first letter, and intended to be used here.

[No. 6.]

*Oliver Johnson to George F. White.*143 NASSAU STREET,
NEW-YORK, NOV. 26, 1840. }

GEORGE F. WHITE :

My Brother—In your note to me of the 21st inst., you stated, that when I should furnish you with the name of the Friend from whom I derived the information which induced me to open this correspondence, you might give to my communications such further attention as you should think they deserved. Without hesitation or delay, I gave you the name of the Friend alluded to ; but, although several days have since elapsed, you have paid no “ further attention ” to my reasonable and respectful request. Will you be kind enough to inform me, definitely, whether I am to regard your last note as final, so far as that matter is concerned ? The bearer is instructed to wait for your answer.

Your friend,

OLIVER JOHNSON.

[No. 7.]

George F. White to Oliver Johnson.

OLIVER JOHNSON :

I hope to give attention to the non-resistance case, and also to thy case, in due time.

Thy friend,

GEO. F. WHITE.

NEW-YORK, 11 mo. 27, 1840.

[No. 8.]

*Oliver Johnson to George F. White.*143 NASSAU STREET,
NEW-YORK, NOV. 27, 1840. }

GEORGE F. WHITE :

My Brother—The evasive and indefinite character of your note of this date, and also of that of the 20th inst., makes it incumbent upon me to address you again,

and to ask you, respectfully, to inform me, at once and distinctly, whether you decline giving me the name of the "regular lecturer" on non-resistance, alluded to in your letter of the 20th inst. ; and of the place where and the time when the "threat" of forcible entry to a meeting-house, by a friend or friends of the N. R. Society, to which you alluded in your communication to the Rose-st. meeting, and in your note of the latter date, was made. This information I have a right to demand, for reasons which I need not repeat ; and which must be satisfactory to every impartial mind ; and if your public accusation rests upon authority which affords the least justification, or even apology for it, you can have no reason for withholding that information for a single hour. I therefore must insist upon an immediate and final answer to my request, one way or the other ; and in case of a refusal to furnish me with the information I ask, I shall feel at liberty to publish our correspondence, in order to counteract, in some measure, what I shall *then* have good reason for believing was an unauthorized and unjustifiable attack upon the innocent. The bearer will wait for your answer.

Your friend and brother,
OLIVER JOHNSON.

[No. 9.]

George F. White to Oliver Johnson.

OLIVER JOHNSON :

In reply to thine of this day, I have only to state, that thy course of "duty" towards ————, and my course towards a fourth party, from a sense of propriety, do not run parallel. I shall take a reasonable time, (say from ten to fifteen days from the time I received thy first note,) to hear from my informant, before I make my final communication to thee.

I do not find it among my duties to prescribe a course for thee.

Thy friend,

GEO. F. WHITE.

NEW-YORK, 11 mo. 27, 1840.

[No. 10.]

*Oliver Johnson to George F. White.*143 NASSAU STREET,
NEW-YORK, Nov. 28, 1840. }

GEORGE F. WHITE :

My Brother—From your last note, received yesterday, it appears that you are not prepared to give me a final answer to my request until you can hear from your informant. I regret that you did not frankly give me this information at the outset, as in that case my mind would have rested quietly for the time being, and I should have been spared the disagreeable necessity of pressing you further upon the subject. I shall most cheerfully wait for your answer the time you have specified.

Kindly and truly your friend,
OLIVER JOHNSON.

[No. 11.]

George F. White to Oliver Johnson.

NEW-YORK, 12 mo. 3d, 1840.

OLIVER JOHNSON :

I now propose to give to thy several communications the further attention to which I may think them entitled. For ready reference, I will number some of the principal extracts which I may deem it necessary to make from them.

All of them are headed, "143 Nassau-st., New-York;" and the first, which is dated Nov. 20, 1840, runs thus: (No. 1,) "I have just been informed by a highly respectable member of the Society of Friends, who was present on the occasion, that in a public communication to the Rose-street meeting yesterday, you spoke of the Non-Resistance Society as an institution formed 'in the will of man;'" (No. 2,) "and in proof of this position you stated, that on a certain occasion, a company of its members or friends, who had been refused admission to some building, provided themselves with implements for effecting a forcible entrance." "Now as I am a member of the Non-Resist-

ance Society,—having assisted in its organization, and signed its Declaration of Sentiments,—and therefore publicly identified with it," &c. (No. 3,) "Nor will you deem it improper, in these circumstances, that I should call upon you to inform me when and where our Society, or any members or friends of it, were guilty of the conduct which you have attributed to them—or at least, to give me the authority on which your statement was made." (No. 4,) "I take it for granted, that you would not make so grave a charge upon mere idle rumor; nor am I willing to suppose that you would be guilty of 'bearing false witness.'"

This communication, viewed through any medium to which I had access, was of equivocal character. If the sole object of the writer were to obtain the information, which, alone, he professed to be seeking, why did he not ask for it in the usual manner, and in a few lines? Commencing with "though a stranger to you," why did he doubt my honesty? why read me a homily upon the duties of "a professed minister of the gospel of Peace"?—Why did he intimate his apprehension that I might "make a grave charge upon idle rumor;" that I might "be guilty of bearing false witness?" (See extract No. 4.) The writer, said I, must be dishonest, or weak. Perhaps he is a stripling, but recently released from the government of the pedagogue's birch; then recollecting "the port he hailed from," or, more properly, his *eyry*, I deemed it probable that he was an *unfledged philanthropist* that had fallen from the nest. I replied respectfully; and perceiving he had made two distinct allegations, (see extracts 1 and 2,) I stated, in terms not to be misunderstood, that the first was not true, and that the second was a misrepresentation. There I rested, waiting to see if one who could discourse so eloquently upon christian duties, and "all that sort of thing," would award *to me* that which he, under similar circumstances, was claiming, obstreperously, *from me*.

The next day came to hand thy second epistle. It contained no apology—it hinted not at the source of the false charge, nor at the origin of the misrepresentation. It contained not even a regret that I had so good a cause for recrimination. Having seen what *should have been in it* that was not, let us now see *what was there*.

Touching the first allegation, (see extract No. 1,) for which there is not a pretext, it runs thus : " This, however, I do not deem material." Then comes a homily upon the duties of honorable men and the obligations of christians. Here I will observe, that thy informant has furnished me with such evidence as to leave no doubt, that the first allegation was known to the writer of it to be untrue when he penned it ; and the misrepresentation in the second was made in the hope that it would effect something " material" for thy purpose ;—but more of this anon.

It is then asserted, that I made an impression (of course upon thy informant) that I alluded to " the New England Non-Resistance Society," inasmuch as there is but that, and another, viz : " the Oberlin (Ohio) Non-Resistance Society," and whether I did or did not refer to the former, that I am bound to " correct the impression."

Unfortunately for thee, thy informant, at the time spoken of, *knew not of the existence of either of these Non-Resistance Societies, nor of any other one.*

In the public communication which furnished to thee a pretext to open this correspondence, I referred to an instance of some (or one or more) of a body of men, professing non-resistance principles : I made not even a distant allusion to *the* Non-Resistance Society ; and would not now be willing to distinguish between these "*Dromios*," nor attempt to point out which of these is the real " Simon Pure." I knew not but the brood of non-resistance societies was as numerous as that of anti-slavery societies ; and, from the fact of thy dating from what I have long looked upon as the head quarters of much that is anomalous in philanthropy, morals, and religion, I was warranted in the supposition that *the* Non-Resistance Society (the real " Simon Pure,") was in this city.

Nor did I hint at any locality ; therefore, for aught the audience upon that occasion *heard from me*, I am at liberty to show that the circumstance to which I referred took place in Kamschatka or Kalamazoo, in California or Communipaw, or wherever else, for the time, hypocrisy prevailed and cant predominated.

This, thy second letter, made me acquainted with the character of my correspondent, and I demanded from him

that which he should have tendered to me in his first communication.

In thy third letter, thou gave me the name of ———, as that of *thy informant*, and I freely admit that he is a “highly respectable member of the Society of Friends;” and as freely assert my belief, that he is a man of *unimpeachable veracity*. He, then, thy informant, stated to me, that he called upon Isaac T. Hopper on other business than this; but, during the interview with him, made some inquiry relating to a Society which professed non-resistance principles, (being wholly ignorant, until he heard me refer to such a body, of the existence of any such,) when Isaac called out, “Oliver,” and a person (I presume Oliver Johnson) stepped out, *into sight*, and began to interrogate him. That he, ———, gave, as near as he could then recollect, my words: *that he did not say a word of any thing which is contained in thy first allegation*. Respecting the second, thou asked him distinctly, once, if not twice, “Did he say they collected implements (or instruments?)” to which *thy informant* as distinctly replied, “*he did not say so.*”

Now, according to thy own words, thou must have immediately written the *first allegation*, upon the subject of which thy informant *spoke not*; and written out in the second, as resting upon his authority, that which he denied when thou put the question touching the fact to him.

Thou says, “*I have just been informed,*” and then proceeds to assert, as coming from ———, what ——— said not; and second, as coming from him that which he denied when thou put the question to him.— Well may thou say, “It is quite possible that neither of us was *literally accurate.*”

The art of manufacturing, *without a raw material*, appears to be wholly confined to the intellectual world. Altho’ thou art an adept in the production of these fabrics, thou hast not a claim to originality for it: some of the same “style of goods” was produced as far back as the time of our first parents, by a contemporary of theirs, a cunning workman, and an inmate of the garden of Eden. “Heir looms,” descending *from him in a right line*, are numerous; and weaving upon them, to borrow the language of

our late Recorder, "has been practised to a great extent in this community."

Take the advice of a friend, and try thy hand in the grosser world of matter. If thou shalt succeed in producing any thing, which, having *no raw material for its basis*, shall nourish or protect the body, thou wilt find it more profitable to thyself, (perhaps more useful to thy fellow-men) to attend to that "branch of business," than to preach or *write for hire*. If, however, thou shalt not succeed, thy claim to *originality of attempt* will not soon be disputed.

Returning to thy letter, next in order is a pretended extract from one of my letters, being marked as, and asserted to be, a quotation from one of them; and which is as far from the truth as was "*material to thy purpose*;" neither the words nor the sense of which, being in any of my communications to thee or to others. The objects sought by this *forgery* appear to be, to fasten upon me the charge of implicating a regular lecturer in the threat to make a forcible entry, &c., and, in default of proof, to demand reparation.

I said not, the lecturer was "*among*" those that threatened, nor "*among*" those that *negotiated for the key*. He may have been with both parties; and, he may have been with neither party; he may have known the terms upon which the key was procured, and been willing to carry out his part, under any circumstances; and, he may have been ignorant of these terms, and been governed, throughout, by the nicest sense of honor. I have said nothing which can be justly considered inculpatory or exculpatory of him.

The most curious part of this correspondence is thy declaration, that it is not "*material*" whether the party "collected implements to make a forcible entry," or only "threatened." "*The threat is all that is important, since it could not, of course, have been carried into effect without 'implements' suited to the purpose.*"

According to this, *thy decision*, it is not "*material*" whether a man, in a state of high excitement, smarting under the sense of supposed wrongs, "threatens" to take the life of a fellow man; or, carefully selects and purchases pistols and bullet-mould, powder, lead, and per-

cussion-caps, and proceeds deliberately to cast his bullets and try his caps.

"A Daniel come to judgment! yea, a Daniel!"

"O wise young judge, how do I honor thee!"

I have in hand six of thy epistles, and when I sat down to make my final reply, I intended to go through the whole number; but, tiring with the third, I relinquish a moiety of my design. I will, however, for a specimen of hypocrisy, refer to the opening of the fifth, which runs thus: "My Brother,—The *evasive and indefinite character* of your note of this date, and also of that of the 21st inst., makes it incumbent upon me to address you again, and to ask you, *respectfully*, to inform me, *at once and distinctly*," &c. I have underscored some belligerent words, which stand in such harmless and glorious juxtaposition, as to leave little doubt of our proximity to the millennium.

For a spice of *cant*, take the concluding paragraph of the third,—“Yours, in human brotherhood.”

I will not say, that thou hast come into this “breathing world”——two centuries after thy time; but, if I were compelled to speak upon the subject, I might say, if thou had lived at the time of the Rump Parliament, thou wouldst have found kindred spirits among the worthy compeers of the celebrated “Praise-god Barebone.”

The name of the person from whom I received my information touching the non-resistance case, is Samuel Griffith, of, or near, Mount Pleasant, Jefferson County, Ohio.

This communication is the last notice I can take of thee until thou be improved in morals and mended in manners.

Thy friend,

GEO. F. WHITE.

[No. 12.]

Oliver Johnson to George F. White.

143 NASSAU STREET, }
NEW-YORK, Dec. 10, 1840. }

GEORGE F. WHITE :

My Brother—Yours of the 3d inst. was duly received, and, but for the declaration at its close, would have been

promptly answered in a private way. Whether my conduct towards you has been such as to afford any justification or apology for that declaration, is a question which I am entirely willing to submit, without remark or self-defence, to the judgment of those who may read our correspondence. Your conduct, I am sorry to say, has left me no alternative but to address you in this manner.

You have given me the name of the person on whose authority your public accusation was made, and I shall spare no pains in investigating the matter to its foundation. Without venturing to anticipate the result of my inquiries, and waiving, for the present, any remarks upon the main subject of our correspondence, I will notice several things in your last communication which appear to demand some slight attention.

1. You complain of my first letter, that it appears to you to be "of equivocal character;" and you even profess to find in it evidence either of "dishonesty" or "weakness" on my part. I am not anxious to defend myself against this charge. I will only appeal from your judgment to the candor and good sense of the reader, at the same time putting it to your own conscience, whether your commentary upon my language is not unjust. Did it imply a doubt of your honesty, to "*take it for granted* that you would NOT make a grave charge upon idle rumor," and to express an *unwillingness* "to suppose that you would be guilty of bearing 'false witness?'" If so, then I must plead guilty to the charge of being too "weak" to understand the import of my own words. My letter may appear awkward to the eye of a refined critic,—it may be much longer than was necessary,—but, I submit whether there is any thing, either in its language or spirit, at which a Christian could justly take offence.

2. Your complaint respecting my second letter, that "it contained no apology" for what you term a "false charge" in the first, strikes me as somewhat singular.—It may have been owing to my dullness of apprehension, but it is nevertheless true, that at the time of writing that letter, the thought had not even entered my mind that you were dissatisfied with any thing that I had reported as coming from my informant, except the statement that you

had spoken of the Non-Resistance Society as formed "in the will of man." I began my second letter with an admission, that on *this* point there had been a mistake ; and if you had been equally explicit on the other, I should as cheerfully have admitted, that in relation to that also there appeared to have been some misunderstanding. I now see, on a comparison of your language in relation to the point alluded to with that which I reported as having come from my informant, that I might have *inferred* that you were unwilling to admit the latter to be correct. If I am blameworthy, however, for being so intent upon the main subject as not to draw an *inference* on a collateral point, I submit to your candor, whether you are not at least equally so for your own want of explicitness. But this is a small matter.

One word more, and I have done on this point. You attempt to throw ridicule upon the remark in my third letter, that it was not "material" whether implements were collected or not—the "threat" to enter the house *by force* being all that was essential. Your sarcasm is pointless, because it rests upon a perversion of what I said. The real question is not so much what is the *degree* of guilt involved in the case, as whether the persons accused were guilty of a flagrant violation of their professed principles ; and I repeat, that it is of very little consequence, in settling *this* question, whether the threat was or was not followed by the demonstrations alluded to.

3. I confess my inability to discover why the ignorance of my informant in relation to the Non-Resistance Society is "unfortunate *for me*." It surely does not follow from *that* circumstance, that you did not make the "impression" of which I spoke. That you did make such an "impression," I had evidence which satisfied my own mind, derived from sources to which I did not deem it necessary to refer ; and I very much doubt whether you will venture to make a distinct denial of the correctness of my statement.

4. You speak of the Non-Resistance Society in language of contempt. If you really are as ignorant of that Society and its operations as your words imply, I submit to the reader—nay, to your own sense of propriety—whether you are qualified to feel contempt either for it or

its advocates ; much more, whether you are qualified to aver, as you have done in public, that it came up "*out of the bottomless pit.*" If you claim to have spoken thus from Divine inspiration, then I will leave it for others to decide how far the temper you manifest supports such a claim. But how surprising it must seem to the opposers of non-resistance in other denominations, that a minister of the Society of Friends can utter the language of scorn and reproach towards an institution based upon the identical principles which the early founders of that Society promulgated, and for which they suffered untold persecution from the enemies of truth and righteousness !

5. You say, that you have "long looked upon" the Anti-Slavery Office "as the head quarters of much that is anomalous in morals, philanthropy and religion." In this opinion you are in "unity" with all the slaveholders, the apologists for slavery, the intemperate and profane, the proud despisers of the poor, the advocates of lynch law, and the "hireling priests" of the day ! All these will agree, that there is nothing so "anomalous" as the Divine requisitions, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof"—"Break every yoke, let the oppressed go free"—"Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them"—"Remember them that are in bonds as bound with them"—"Deliver him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor"—"Open thy mouth for the dumb, in the cause of all such as are appointed to destruction," &c. &c.—These comprise the "morals, philanthropy and religion" of the American Anti-Slavery Society. It is for obeying these divine injunctions, according to the understanding of our own minds, and in accordance with the stern demands of our consciences, that we have been hated and opposed by all that is corrupt, tyrannical, oppressive and pharisaical in the land. For this, the mob has assailed us—for this, corrupt politicians have heaped their invectives upon our heads—and for this, "hireling priests" and time-serving ministers, of *all* denominations, have hurled at us their denunciations and anathemas. Whether it be a greater "anomaly in morals, philanthropy and religion," to see a body of men associated together, in the fear of God, for the purpose of breaking the chains of enslaved

millions, than to find a minister of the Society of Friends mingling his voice with that of a pro-slavery press, pulpit and mob, in denouncing them as "hypocrites" and "emissaries of Satan," is a question on which I will pronounce no judgment. I do not wonder, however, that a man who does not hesitate to declare, that he would as soon go to a theatre as to an anti-slavery meeting composed exclusively of members of the same denomination of which he is a minister, and who, instead of thanking God for the emancipation of 800,000 human beings in the West Indies from chains and slavery, can contradict his express declarations by prophesying evil concerning that sublime moral reformation, should be hostile to an association whose object it is to break the fetters of millions of his own countrymen. Nor do I wonder, that, while rewards are offered at the South for the heads of abolitionists, a man holding such principles could travel as a preacher in that part of the country, not only without personal danger, but even with the silent acquiescence of the worst of tyrants and oppressors. Certainly, if slaveholders were to obstruct the movements of such a man, it would be from a misapprehension of his real sentiments, and because, seeing him in the garb of a Friend, they had taken it for granted that he was, what they well know the principles of that Society, if fully and heartily embraced, would make him—viz. an abolitionist.

6. I will next notice the charge of willful falsehood, which you gravely prefer against me, on the authority, professedly, of the person from whom I derived my information respecting the statement which first induced me to address you. The first thought which must suggest itself to every reflecting mind, on reading this charge, is, that it is utterly improbable, and even ridiculous, in view of the facts. What possible temptation could I have been under, *in writing to you*, to misrepresent what my informant had told me respecting your own public statement? If I had written to any other person than yourself, there might have been some plausibility in your impeachment; but the idea that I should in the first place designedly misrepresent what my informant told me, and then put myself in your power by freely and unhesitatingly giving you his name, is as strange as it is prepos-

terous. A simple explanation will not only show that your charge against me is without foundation, but that I have far more reason for bringing a similar one against yourself; for, at the same time that you are so ready to accuse me of writing what I knew to be false respecting the statements of my informant, (without making any allowance for what, to say the least, might have been an honest mistake,) you have yourself entirely misapprehended the testimony of the same individual! In proof of this, I offer the following certificate, which I have in the hand writing, and under the signature of the man whom you have admitted to be a "highly respectable member of the Society of Friends," and "A MAN OF UNIMPEACHABLE VERACITY," and on whose authority you have ventured to charge me with willful falsehood:

CERTIFICATE.

"On the 20th of 11th mo. 1840, I called at the Anti-Slavery Office, No. 143 Nassau street, and while there had a conversation with Isaac T. Hopper and Oliver Johnson, relative to some remarks made by George F. White on the preceding fourth day, in Rose-street meeting, on the subject of non-resistance. Having heard the latter, in the course of his communication, charge some members of a body professing non-resistance principles with assembling and evincing a disposition to enter a meeting-house by force, and having been surprised by such a charge, I was led to inquire of Isaac T. Hopper if he knew what society or body of people was alluded to, and whether he was acquainted with any circumstance like that described by George F. White. He called Oliver Johnson, who stated that he was one of the original members of that society, and could not believe that such an event took place. My statement of George F. White's remarks was, I think, *correctly reported by Oliver Johnson in his note to the former of the 11th mo. 20th, in every respect but the following, where he speaks of the persons in question "having provided themselves with implements."* On this point I think that both he and Isaac T. Hopper misunderstood me.) Also, whether George F. White asserted, at the time referred to, that the Non-Resistance Society was formed "*in the will of man,*" I could not say *positively*, for I did not charge my mind to mark his words on this point; but my impression was, that he did use that phrase. As that, however, was immaterial, and a mere matter of opinion, I did not aim to be positive concerning it. During *this* conversation, Oliver Johnson asked me *no questions* as to whether George F. White asserted "that implements were procured;" and I have no doubt that, in his letter to the latter, before alluded to, he stated the matter fairly and honestly, according to the impressions which he and Isaac T. Hopper received during our brief conversation. On my arrival in the city on the 26th, _____ informed me that Isaac T. Hopper wished to see me immediately at 143 Nassau street,* and handed me a note from Oliver

*The message left by Isaac T. Hopper was, not that he wished to see my informant, but that *I* wished to see him. I. T. H. was the bearer of

Johnson of the same import. I accordingly went there. The questions respecting "*the implements*" were put to me during this *second* interview, held after he had disclosed my name to George F. White, and after the latter had denied using the language in question. On the evening of the 27th, I waited on George F. White, and had some conversation on the foregoing subject; but, from his letter of 12th mo., 3d., to Oliver Johnson, it would appear that he understood me to say to him, that the question alluded to was put to me by the latter in the course of the first conversation; and this mistake has led him to charge the latter with having written what he knew to be untrue. I make this explanation, at the request of Oliver Johnson, to acquit him of willful misrepresentation, as his conduct appears to me to have been honest and upright in this transaction.

New York, 12th mo. 7th, 1840.

Your charge of falsehood rests on two distinct specifications, both of which are thus contradicted by your own "UNIMPEACHABLE" witness. (1.) You assert, that my informant told you, that he said nothing to me about your having remarked that the Non-Resistance Society was formed "in the will of man;" whereas, he distinctly admits, in the foregoing certificate, that his statement of your remarks was correctly reported by me, "in every respect," save only where I spoke of the accused "having provided themselves with implements," &c. (2.) You assert, that my informant told you, not only that he did *not* say that you spoke of "implements," but that he even told me the contrary, "once if not twice," in answer to a question distinctly put by myself. It appears from the certificate, that you have confounded the conversation which occurred *before* my letter was written, with another which took place several days afterwards, and subsequent to your denial of the correctness of my statement. The question alluded to was put during the second interview, and of course can avail nothing as evidence of my want of veracity. As a proof that I did not designedly misrepresent what my informant said on this point, I have liberty to state, that Isaac T. Hopper understood him as I did. You will observe also, that the "highly respectable" author of the certificate has borne his testimony to my honesty and uprightness in the transaction.

I do not find it in my heart to imitate your example, by charging you with willful falsehood, on account of your

my note, for no other reason than because it so happened that he was to pass by the residence of my informant at the time referred to, and was willing, at my request, to save me the trouble of going myself.—O. J.

misunderstanding the testimony of your own "unimpeachable" witness. I should feel, that, in doing so, I was acting contrary to every principle of honor and justice, and to that charity which hopeth all things and thinketh no evil. It is not to be supposed, for a moment, that you would designedly misrepresent what our mutual friend had told you, when you knew that I should have ample means for exposing such misrepresentation. You doubtless misunderstood him; and I regret, for your own sake, that you were not charitable enough to make the same admission in respect to myself, instead of accusing me in the manner you have done. I appeal to you as a man, and especially as a professed minister of the gospel, whether you do not owe it to yourself promptly to retract your charge. If you can make peace with your conscience on any other terms—but I will not finish the sentence.

7. You have added to the catalogue of my offences that of "forgery!" (See p. 17.) This, if possible, is even more preposterous than the charge last noticed. It is not only absurd in itself, but so glaringly untrue, that I wonder how you could gravely present it. If you will do yourself the justice to look again at your first letter, and then at the extract which you alledge to be a "forgery," in my reply, (see p. 10,) you will perceive that all the words which I have marked as a quotation are faithfully transcribed. The clause included in parenthesis, excepting only the words "regular lecturer," does not purport to be a quotation. The quotation ends immediately before that clause, and commences again immediately afterwards, with the intervention of single word. The idea that the insertion of that parenthetical clause was intended to "fasten" any thing upon you, is shown to be absurd by the fact, that my letter was sent, not to a third person, but to yourself. The truth is, as the reader will see, it implies, not that the "regular lecturer," was one of those who made the "threat,"—least of all that *you* had made any such assertion,—but only that he belonged to the same body with those who had committed the offence. It is not a little remarkable, that, on *your own* principle, you are guilty of the same offence which you have unjustly attributed to me. Turn to your first let-

ter on page 6, and you will see, that in the very first paragraph, you have inserted a parenthetical clause of your own in the middle of a quotation from me ; and you have not, as I did, separated my language from your own by marks of quotation before and after the parenthesis ! Are you therefore guilty of "forgery"? I do not believe it, but *you* must, if you try yourself by your own standard.

8. You charge me with "cant" and "hypocrisy" for addressing you as "my brother." To this I have only to say, that if I had occasion to address the worst criminal in the world, I should use the same appellation. I addressed you as "respected friend" until I could conscientiously do so no longer, when I adopted, instead of that phrase, another of universal application, which implied nothing more, in my own mind, than a simple recognition of your membership in the great human family. It did not occur to me that you would understand it in any other light.

9. How far the general tone and spirit of your letter, and the epithets which you heap so profusely upon me, comport with the courtesy and dignity which should characterize the "manners" and "morals" of a well-bred man, (to say nothing of your professions as a Friend and a minister of the gospel!) I leave for others to judge.

Your friend,

OLIVER JOHNSON.

[No. 13.]

Oliver Johnson to George F. White.

143 NASSAU STREET, }
NEW-YORK, Feb. 15, 1841. }

GEORGE F. WHITE :

My Brother—Having completed my investigation of the authority on which you rested your charge against non-resistants, it now becomes my duty to communicate the result to you and the public.

In the first place, let us look at the charge, and see what it comprehends ; and then we shall be prepared to

judge whether it is sustained or rebutted by the testimony which I shall present. These are your own words :

"At the time referred to, I asserted [in the Rose-street meeting,] that a man could not, by a mere act of volition, assume and carry out in practice, the principles of non-resistance. I stated that there was a case of recent occurrence, in which *some*, (or, one or more) of a body professing these principles, threatened to make a forcible entry into a house from which they believed they were unjustly excluded."—p. 7.

In your last communication, you say—

"I made not even a distant allusion to *the* Non-Resistance Society."—p. 15.

In another part of the same letter, however, you distinctly admit, that you referred to *a* Non-Resistance Society. These are your words :

"Thy informant stated to me, that he called on Isaac T. Hopper on other business than this; but, during the interview with him, made some inquiry relating to A SOCIETY which professed non-resistance principles, being wholly ignorant, until HE HEARD ME REFER TO SUCH A BODY, [i. e. a non-resistance Society,] of the existence of any such."—p. 16.

Now as you admit that you referred to *a* Non-Resistance Society, and as there were at that time only two such societies in the world, no person acquainted with the circumstances can be at any loss to understand your meaning, or the impression you made. Although these admissions would seem to be sufficiently clear to justify me in supposing, as I did, that you intended to refer to the New-England Non-Resistance Society. I deem it proper to say, that I have evidence, which satisfies me, that you have been careful to admit considerably *less than the whole truth* in relation to your remarks on the occasion referred to. I have been informed, that, in connection with the charge, you poured out your usual torrent of epithets upon *the* or *a* Non-Resistance Society, (it matters little which;) and when it is considered, that the society above mentioned is the only one of the kind, which has ever attracted much public attention, or been a point of attack for a "hireling ministry," and a time-serving press, there would seem to be no room to doubt the intent and bearing of your charges.

In your first letter (p. 7,) you say—

"My information was obtained from a person who gave ground, as

specified in the deed, *exclusively for the use of the religious Society of Friends*, and had control of the key to a house which had been erected upon it, when the persons above spoken of demanded it: he refused assent until they assured him no lecture would be delivered in the house, as Friends desired the use of it only for an evening's consultation. He afterwards learned, that a regular lecturer, who was in waiting, whose name he gave me, and who was not a member of the Society of Friends, delivered a lecture, in direct violation of the terms upon which the key was obtained."

In your last letter, you gave the name of Samuel Griffith as that of your informant. How far his testimony supports your assertions, the following letter will show:

Letter from Samuel Griffith.

MOUNT PLEASANT, Ohio, }
12th mo. 25th, 1840. }

RESPECTED FRIEND, OLIVER JOHNSON:

In answer to thine of the 5th, I can say, that I believe the statement, which thou informs me George F. White made in Rose-street meeting, was substantially correct; and I have no doubt that he got his information from me, as I recollect the subject of the meeting alluded to coming up in conversation when in George's company; and being in possession of the information, I suppose I imparted it, if not in the same language he made use of, no doubt I did in substance; not with an expectation that it would ever be related again, much less that I was furnishing matter for a discourse of the kind alluded to in thine; of which I do not complain, as in my opinion he had a right to make such use of the information as he thought would promote a good or retard a bad cause, which I leave to his feeling and judgment.

In George's letter of the 20th ult., as quoted by thee, there are one or two unimportant errors, (which is no cause of astonishment, considering my general imperfect manner of explaining myself, and his depending on memory,) which I shall correct. 1st, I did not intend to convey the idea that I gave the ground on which the house in question was erected; (the amount of the cost of said lot was donated by my father, who is deceased;) but I did give the title, and it is specified in the deed, that it is for the use of the "religious Society of Friends, for a place of meeting, and no other use." 2d, I did not intend to be understood, that the key was in my possession, it being in the hands of a friend living near the meeting-house; and I did not know any thing of the conditions upon which it was given up until some time subsequently.

In answer to thy first special query, I will state, that James Boyle was the regular lecturer. He spoke upon the doctrine of non-resistance that evening.

To the 2d, Elwood, or perhaps his name may be Thomas Elwood Longshore, was one who, I am informed by good authority, made the threat. That he was a member of a Non-Resistance Society, I have no better evidence than that my neighbors who attend the meetings of the Methodists and Presbyterians, and advocate the doctrines of said societies, belong to those churches; (but the charge appears to be that they professed non-resistance.)

To the 3d, the circumstances alluded to took place the 3d of 9th mo. 1840, at and near the new Short Creek meeting-house in this township.

I have given but two names, which I consider to cover the charges,

believing that the cause of peace will be better subserved by withholding my friends' names than otherwise.

But in justice to James Boyle, an individual for whom I have much respect, I must say, that I have no knowledge that he was apprised of the conditions upon which the house was obtained.

I received thine several days ago, but the death of a near relation having intervened, which called me a distance from home, and the press of my business (that of a farmer) which accumulated during my absence, and letter writing always being irksome, will be accepted by thee as an apology for the delay of this from thy friend,

SAMUEL GRIFFITH.

Your friend will certainly not be accused of any lack of disposition to justify your course as far as possible ; but, notwithstanding his charitable admission, that your " statement " was "*substantially correct*," (an admission which contrasts singularly enough with *your* zeal in charging *me* with downright falsehood for misunderstanding, in one unimportant particular, the statements made by *my* informant !) he nevertheless contradicts you in two particulars, viz : 1. He denies that he gave the land on which the house was erected. 2. He says that he had not control of the key, and " did not know any thing of the conditions upon which it was given up *until some time subsequently*."

It seems, also, that all his information is derived from " rumor," whether " idle " or substantial, we shall see hereafter. I ask you now, which of us has the most occasion for charging the other with falsehood for not being "*literally accurate*?" This question is not put as a taunt, for I am willing to believe that, in respect to the points on which you are thus contradicted, you intended to state the truth. If the contradiction shall have the effect to make you more candid, and more scrupulous of accusing others, *you* will have cause to be thankful, and *my* object will be fully answered.

Your informant having given me the name of Thomas E. Longshore, as " one who, he was *informed* by good authority, made the threat," I deemed it right to apprise him of the accusation, that he might have an opportunity to say whether it was true or false. In a letter which I have just received from him, he says :

" I regret that such a report should have gained a circulation and produced so much disturbance. . . . Unpleasant as it is to be implicated in the affair, as I am to be forced to the alternative of enduring the stigma, or of repelling the charge, when truth and justice make the demand, I cannot, and hope I may never hesitate to comply, even if by

so doing I lose that friendship and respect always before enjoyed, and hoped ever to be retained.

"I have no recollection of having made any threat of the kind, or of having entertained any feeling or sentiment at the time, that could possibly have induced me to do so. I cannot conceive it possible, that I even thought of such a thing, much less of doing it. I am sure I felt no disposition to do the thing which I am charged with threatening to do; and doubtless this must have been well known by those with whom the report originated."

I have not the pleasure of an acquaintance either with the accused or with your informant; consequently, it does not become me to say, which is most worthy of credence, the denial of the former or the *hearsay* accusation of the latter. But I deem it right to present the following testimony of Samuel Myers, a minister of the Society of Friends, in New-Lisbon, Ohio, contained in a letter now lying before me:

"I believe it due from me to state, that I have more acquaintance with T. E. Longshore than any person in this section can have, and I am prepared to say, that I believe him incapable of entertaining a disposition to use force improperly on any occasion, much less on the one referred to. I therefore am prepared to say, that I believe him innocent of the charge."

But if it were even true, that Thos. E. Longshore had made the threat of which he is accused, there would still be no ground to justify your assault either upon *a* or *the* Non-Resistance Society; for, in his letter, before alluded to, he says—

"I AM NOT A MEMBER OF ANY NON-RESISTANCE SOCIETY, AND NEVER HAVE BEEN."

But he adds—

"I AM A MEMBER OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS. I HAD A BIRTH-RIGHT IN THAT SOCIETY, AND STILL RETAIN IT."

If, therefore, he is guilty of the conduct laid to his charge, (which I do not believe,) I submit whether it would not be more consistent with truth, as well as more modest in you, to withhold your denunciations; or if that is impossible, at least to bestow them upon some Society of which he is a member!

So much for the charge against Thomas E. Longshore; and I venture to predict, that when your informant shall assume the responsibility of openly laying the same accusation at the door of any of those *other* "friends" to whom he makes a somewhat equivocal allusion, although

he very charitably withholds their names, out of regard to "the cause of peace," (!) they will be able to make an equally triumphant defence. If Samuel Griffith had manifested a concern for "the cause of peace," at an earlier period in this affair, equal to that which now appears to influence his conduct, I cannot help thinking, that he would never have spread such a report in relation to a member of his own religious society, without first admonishing the brother himself of his fault.

Here I might rest the case, but it seems proper that I should present some of the testimony with which I have been furnished in relation to the character of the meeting alluded to, and the circumstances attending it.

After stating the object of the meeting to have been "to compare views on the subject of peace, and how far Friends were bearing a faithful testimony in favor of this important principle," and that it had first been appointed to be held in a school-house, THOMAS E. LONGSHORE says :

"When the hour for meeting arrived, it was believed that the school-house would be too small to accommodate it. It was then suggested by some one present, but I know not whom, that the meeting-house would be preferable to the school-house, and that the meeting could be held there. All present approved of the change, and believed there would be little if any objection. This conversation was held by members of the Society in attendance at the yearly meeting. They were then at or near Elizabeth Griffith's house, and in sight of the Short Creek meeting-house. The proposition was immediately submitted to several others, and received approbation. It was soon ascertained that Jonathan Evans, living with George Evans, his own son and the son-in-law of Elizabeth Griffith, and who lived in a part of her house, had the key and the care of the meeting-house. I went to George and inquired for his father, &c. He told me that he himself had the key, and would keep it, or that we could not have it till we got the consent of the trustees, or a majority of them, or to this effect—in a tone and temper, which, I was sorry to see, evinced some displeasure at the moment. I inquired who the trustees were. He informed me, I think, that they were William Robinson, Samuel Griffith, and I do not recollect who else. I remarked, that they would have no objection, or that their consent could be obtained. He replied, that we could have the key then, and not till then. This is the substance of our conversation. I recollect no threat, nor any thing being said that could be so construed, or justify such a report. I looked upon George as my friend, and the kind treatment I received at his house, before and after this conversation, I thought justified me in such a belief. Although we differ in sentiment on some subjects connected with the reforms of the day, I think I entertain the kindest feelings towards him. I left George and went across the road to William Robinson's, stated the case to him, and what George had said. He gave me to understand that there would be no difficulty about the key or the house, and that he would attend to that matter."

The following letter from WILLIAM ROBINSON, contains additional testimony :

Letter from William Robinson.

MOUNT PLEASANT, Ohio, 1st mo. 7th, 1841.

DEAR FRIEND :

Thine of the 25th came duly to hand. I now proceed to answer it.— During our last yearly meeting, several friends were active in getting up the meeting referred to, and others equally interested in it. A general invitation was given in the meeting, for every one to speak, who had a wish to do so, as the meeting was expressly for the free interchange of sentiment. A number spoke, several of whom were ministers, and all members of the Society of Friends, except James Boyle. Nearly all who attended the meeting were members. A friend came to my house, and said the people were collecting, and wished to have the house opened. I immediately went to Johnathan Evans, the care-taker of the house, and asked him for the key to open the meeting-house. His son being present, replied, that Samuel Griffith wished him to tell his father, not to open the house. I asked him why. He said, he or they did not like to have abolition lectures delivered in it. I replied, I did not understand that to be the object of the meeting. I then asked him, who gave Samuel Griffith authority to forbid the use of the house? He replied, he paid so much towards building it. I then said, I believed I had paid more than three times as much as Samuel Griffith, and, upon his principle, I must have a superior claim to the house. I further asked him if he had any objection to the house being made use of. He said no, and told his father he had better hand me the key.

If any threats were made to break open the house, we have no knowledge of them ; and we are also well satisfied that there was not a member of the Non-Resistance Society at the meeting.

Soon after the division of Ohio yearly meeting, in 1828, Evan Griffith, Samuel Griffith's father, in company with several other Friends, had it in contemplation to build a meeting-house on the corner of his land, adjoining mine. He proposed to set off three-fourths of an acre of land for that purpose, if I would add one-fourth of an acre to it, making an acre, which we valued at \$40,00, and went into further subscriptions, with other Friends, to build the house. The meeting-house was not built until since Evan Griffith's death. It now occupies the land that was appropriated for that purpose by us.

I subscribe myself, thy friend,

WILLIAM ROBINSON.

OLIVER JOHNSON.

The following certificate, from seven highly respectable members of the Society of Friends, will speak for itself :

Letter from Samuel Myers and others.

NEW LISBON, Ohio, 1st. mo. 4th, 1841.

ESTEEMED FRIEND, O. JOHNSON :

Thy letter of the 24th last month, addressed to Samuel Myers and Jesse Holmes, is before us ; and in accordance therewith, having been present at Mount Pleasant during the last yearly meeting, and having attended the meeting held at Short Creek, and called a non-resistance meeting, at which time, it appears to be reported, a threat was made

to enter the house by force, by some of those who were interested in the meeting, we believe the following to be a correct statement of the facts as they occurred, viz :

After a conference of several Friends, it was thought desirable to hold a meeting of consultation and for free interchange of sentiment in relation to our testimony in the cause of peace. It was also proposed, that Jesse Holmes announce, at the close of the session of the yearly meeting on *third day evening*, that such meeting would be held in the yearly meeting-house, on *fourth day evening*; which he did, and no one objected in the meeting. By some means, a rumor was immediately in circulation, that the meeting was to be held in the Seceders' meeting-house; and as this was likely in a measure to thwart the object, it was concluded again to announce it at the close of the yearly meeting session on *fourth day evening*, when a good deal of opposition was shown by many Friends, and many reasons were urged against the occupancy of the yearly meeting-house, some of which had a *shadow* of plausibility. It was now so late, that it was doubtful whether any house could be had in time to give notice. However, as some *young* Friends manifested an ardent desire for the meeting, one of them (Carvoer Tomlinson) said he could obtain the district school-house in *Trenton*, a village about one mile west of Mount Pleasant, and obtained the key without difficulty. By this time, a messenger came, we think, from Wm. Robinson, of Short Creek meeting, that the Short Creek *meeting-house* was opened; and leaving an individual at the school-house to give information, to those who came, where the meeting was to be held, those who had already assembled repaired to the meeting-house, which was soon filled.

Now to the questions thou proposest. 1st. "Who obtained the key?" We believe Wm. Robinson was instrumental in getting the key, though we do not know that he went or applied in person. 2d, "Do you know of any who threatened, or who may be charged, directly or indirectly, with having threatened to enter the house by force?" We do not. 3d, "Were those present, or any of them, members of any Non-Resistance Society?" So far as we know, none were (except, perhaps, James and Laura Boyle*.) 4th. "So far as you know, were they all members of the Society of Friends?" They were, as far as we know, with the above exceptions. 5th. "Was a regular lecture delivered?" No; and so far was it from such, it was no more than a meeting for a free interchange of sentiment. It is true, at the solicitation of several Friends, James Boyle gave a succinct history of his progress in his inquiries after truth. The meeting, which sat for about two hours, was addressed by some eight or ten persons, three of whom were Friends, on a *religious visit from other yearly meetings*.

SAMUEL MYERS,
JESSE HOLMES,
GEORGE GARRETSON,
ANNE GARRETSON,
LOT HOLMES,
JUSTUS WRIGHT,
BETSEY WRIGHT.

THOMAS M'CLINTOCK, of Waterloo, a well known min-

* We have reason to believe that James and Laura Boyle were not members of any Non-Resistance Society.

ister of the Society of Friends, who also was present at the meeting alluded to, in a letter before me, says :

"The meeting was opened by some Friend,—I don't now recollect who,—stating the object, that it was to give opportunity of expressing our views, or comparing sentiments on the subject of war, &c. James Boyle* observed, that he believed the desire of the company was to hear our friend Thomas M'Clintock give his views. I then remarked, in reply, that I had come there as a listener and a learner—that I had nothing on my mind at present to say—that I supposed the meeting was intended for a free exchange of views and feelings, and that I hoped that any that had a word would speak that word. Samuel Myers, I think, then rose and expressed himself at some length in general remarks on war, &c. Perhaps one or two others made some brief remarks. Then Nathan Galbreath, I think it was, observed that he thought Friends would like to hear James Boyle give his views; on which James rose and spoke for some time. When he had done, several others spoke, among whom I remember Wm. Thomas, a minister, myself, Joseph A. Dugdale, from Indiana yearly meeting, and, I think, Elizabeth Borton from the same meeting. The meeting closed pleasantly, and I thought it a favored and profitable season."

I feel no inclination to charge either you or your informant with premeditated and willful falsehood; nor will I retort your unwarrantable sarcasm respecting "the art of manufacturing without a raw material," (see p. 16;) but I am sure I shall not be deemed uncharitable, if I say, that *you* especially have manifested a disposition to "take up a reproach against your neighbor," and a recklessness in assailing others, which does not well become your professions. Perhaps it will not be deemed too severe, if I express my concurrence in the opinion of a highly esteemed minister of the Society of Friends, as expressed in a letter now before me, as follows:—"I look upon the carrying of this report to New-York, and its promulgation in Rose-street meeting, as extremely small business."

One of our most distinguished female poets,† speaking of that eminent Christian and Philanthropist, WILLIAM PENN, has said, with much truth and simplicity—

"That the gentle words which hung,
Like a string of pearls, from his cautious lip,
On their silver thread, he was fain to clip,
Lest something more than the truth might slip,
For once, from a Quaker's tongue."

* James Boyle and his wife, though not members of the Society of Friends, were permitted, at their own request, to attend the sessions of the yearly meeting.

† Hannah F. Gould.

I would not, for the world, do you the slightest injustice ; but I must frankly tell you, that, in view of the sweeping denunciations which you have so often heaped upon men eminent for philanthropy and piety, and of the treatment which I have received at your hands, I cannot resist the impression, that you are greatly wanting in that tenderness of spirit, that childlike humility, that serenity of temper, that watchfulness and circumspection, that abnegation of self, so essential in a religious teacher, and which shone so conspicuously in the life of PENN. If I am wrong in this, you will honor me for my plain-dealing ; and if I am right, "open rebuke" may prove "an excellent oil which shall not break your head." I speak, unless I am greatly deceived, in the exercise of some measure of that "charity" which "suffereth long and is kind," which "envieth not," which "vaunteth not itself," which "is not puffed up," which "is not easily provoked," which "thinketh no evil," which "rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in THE TRUTH." If this shall seem to you nothing better than "cant," deal with me as frankly and plainly as I have dealt with you. I hope I may be as ready to receive, as to administer reproof. If I close my ears to kind and affectionate remonstrance, or answer you with sneers and reproaches, then let me be to you "as a heathen man and a publican."

You have alluded reproachfully to the fact, that, while I am devoting myself to the cause of imbruted humanity, my associates, who are blessed with a portion of this world's goods, cheerfully contribute that which is necessary for the supply of my natural wants. If there is any thing sinful in this, either on my part or theirs, I neither see nor feel it. On that, however, as on all other subjects, I desire to know and follow the truth ; and therefore I will endeavor to weigh arguments with candor, to listen patiently to Christian reproof, and to bear reproach with meekness—"not rendering railing for railing." Did it never occur to you, that a man may be a "hireling," and yet receive no salary ? Is it not quite possible, that he might enter even into the station of a minister, not for pecuniary reward, but to gratify his feelings of pride and ambition ? It is my firm conviction, that the ministerial office, at the present day, is more frequently assumed on

account of the honorable distinction which it confers, than from any motives of a pecuniary nature. Hence, even a minister of the Society of Friends *may* be a "hireling." Christ has given us a graphic description of a man of this character.

"But he that is a hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth; and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep."—John x. 12.

Now I ask, where is there a "wolf" more ravenous, or which has devoured a greater number of the lambs of Christ's flock, than SLAVERY? Do not his advocates and apologists often come to us "in sheep's clothing"? Let me ask you, my brother, what have you done to stay the ravages of this blood-stained monster? That you have done all in your power to oppose abolition, and to cast odium upon its advocates, I know; but where is your testimony against slavery? When have you exhorted your hearers to open their mouths for the dumb, and to plead the cause of the poor and needy? When has your sympathy gushed forth, from an overflowing heart, for your "countrymen in chains"? You are not under the temptations incident to a salary, and therefore we have a right to expect that you will give the "wolf" no quarter. Alas! my brother, I greatly fear, that if Israel had not more watchful shepherds than yourself, the sheep would indeed be scattered and devoured.

I cannot forbear, in this connexion, to commend to your careful attention the following extract from a pamphlet lately issued by a Committee of the Philadelphia yearly meeting of Friends:

"It is in vain, for any, in this age of gospel light, when 'God is calling upon man, every where, to repent,' to attempt to cover these crimes under false pretences; their hope is the hope of the hypocrite, that shall perish. Job viii. 13. *It is the duty of all Christians to testify against them, whether they exist in the relation of master and slave, or elsewhere.* BUT IN AN ESPECIAL MANNER DOES IT BEHOOVE THOSE WHO STAND IN THE STATION OF MINISTERS *of the most just, most equal, and most merciful religion of Jesus Christ, to abide faithful in their calling, and to 'cry aloud and spare not.'*"

With no feelings towards you but those of kindness, I subscribe myself,

Your brother,

OLIVER JOHNSON.

A P P E N D I X .

——— "Innocence shall make
False accusation blush."

On Sunday morning, Nov. 29th, 1840, being present at the Rose-street meeting of Friends in New-York, I heard George F. White denounce temperance, anti-slavery and non-resistance societies, in the most opprobrious terms.* Among other things, he charged the whole body of abolitionists, without any exception or qualification, with maintaining the doctrine, *that the only hope of the slave was not in God, nor in the truth, but in themselves.* This doctrine he pronounced "FLAT BLASPHEMY," and then proceeded to speak of the abolitionists, (making no exception whatever,) as "blasphemers," "hypocrites," &c. As I was a member of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and as the charge of blasphemy had been made in the hearing of perhaps 800 people, I felt it to be my duty to deny its truth, in order that so large an assembly might not be deceived, and thus led to oppose the righteous cause of emancipation, and be enabled to quiet their consciences while closing their ears to the cries of the perishing bondman.

I said, accordingly, in substance, that I had risen, from a sense of duty, to make a few remarks; that, as I was not a member of the Society of Friends, it was not unlikely that I might give offence by speaking, and that the fear of this would be sufficient to deter me from doing so, if my conscience would allow me to be silent. I

* For a specimen of some of the epithets which he used on the occasion, I refer the reader to the Introduction.

then stated, that I was one of those whom the speaker had denounced as "blasphemers;" that it had been my privilege, for the last eight years, (in obedience, as I believed, to that "sure word of prophecy" to which the speaker himself had referred,) to be associated in active labors with those who had been struggling to break the fetters of the American slave; that I was extensively acquainted with abolitionists, and had attentively examined those official documents and periodicals from which alone a knowledge of their sentiments could be obtained; and I therefore felt myself qualified to say, and, under a sense of duty, must say, that the charge against them of holding that the only hope of the slave was in themselves, was untrue; that it was not unlikely, that out of 1500 or 2000 anti-slavery societies, scattered in every part of the free States, one or more might have used unguarded language on this point, but that the great body had ever recognized, in the most explicit terms, their dependence on God to give success to all their labors; and I challenged an investigation of their official publications for evidence of the truth of what I had said. I also expressed my grief and astonishment, that a charge of such a character should have been made in a meeting of the Society of Friends, especially as anti-slavery associations had done much, incidentally, to spread the principles of that Society, and to awaken a deep concern for its most important testimonies. It was, I said, owing to my intercourse with Friends, *as an abolitionist*, that my own religious sentiments had undergone so great a change, that I had been led to relinquish the intention, which I once cherished, of becoming a clergyman, to withdraw from the church of which I was a member, and to renounce a corrupt and hireling ministry; and I remarked, that my own experience was similar to that of many others, and that the testimonies of the Society against war, oaths, a hireling ministry, and slavery, I now felt it my duty and privilege to maintain. I observed, that I did not wish the audience to take my testimony as conclusive, but to examine the matter for themselves, and not condemn the abolitionists until they had given their principles a fair examination. In conclusion, I expressed the hope, that the members of a Society whose early founders had often

felt themselves called upon to address the religious assemblies of other sects, not only contrary to the rules of those sects, but even to the laws of the land, would not judge me harshly or uncharitably for speaking as I had done on that occasion.

This is the substance of what I said, and, so far as I recollect, the language I used. Whether my manner was characterized by any impropriety, let those who heard me testify.

Very soon after I sat down, George F. White rose and said, in reply, that he had ample vouchers for all that he had stated, which he would exhibit to *any person* who might wish to examine them, and who would call at his store or dwelling, (naming streets and numbers.) He added, also, that what I had said about the early founders of the Society of Friends having violated the laws of the land, by speaking in the meetings of other sects, was not true ; that such a charge had been made before, by enemies of the Society, but never, so far as he knew, (except in a single instance, in which George Fox was concerned,) had it been substantiated ; and therefore, that while I had indecorously charged him with falsehood, in the face of evidence, I should find it difficult to clear my own skirts of the same offence.

To this I did not deem it my duty to reply, but immediately resolved, that I would accept the invitation, thus publicly given, to call and examine the vouchers on which his charge was founded. Accordingly, on the evening of the next day, in company with James S. Gibbons, (who went with me at my request,) I called at his house, intending to ask him, in a respectful manner, to show me his evidence, and, after copying it, to go quietly away, without entering into any conversation, unless he should desire me to do so. Going as I did, in good faith, agreeably to his own public invitation, I did not anticipate any other than a respectful reception, and Christian treatment. Judge, then, of my surprise, when, on being introduced to him by James S. Gibbons, he stepped back and refused, in a very imperious manner, to receive my hand, saying, at the same time, as nearly as I can recollect, "I cannot receive that man, or have any thing to do with him ;" and adding, in a tone and manner corresponding to

his words, "*I wish him to go immediately out of my house.*" I said, that I had come, at his own invitation, to see the vouchers for the truth of the charge which he had publicly made against the abolitionists on the previous day. "I can have nothing to do with thee." "You decline furnishing me with the evidence, then?" I asked; and again he replied, in an emphatic tone, "*I shall have nothing to do with thee.*" The only answer I made was, that I was sorry to find him in such a state of mind. Turning to James S. Gibbons, he said—"Wast thou at the Rose-street meeting yesterday morning?" "I was," he replied. "Then I am surprised that thou shouldst insult me and my family by bringing that man, who has charged me with falsehood in the presence of 800 people, to my house!" J. S. G. explained, that *I had only denied the truth of his charge*, without saying any thing whatever of him personally, or of his motives. George F. White asked, in a vehement manner, "What security have I, if I admit that man to my house, that he will not, the next moment, spit in my face, or insult my wife and daughters? I am a non-resistant, and therefore defenceless. If he were hungry, I would cheerfully give him a meal; but I must regard his introduction now as an insult to my family:"—to which his wife responded her assent. I stood in silence for some time, while he and J. S. G. kept up an earnest conversation, during which he spoke of me in the most opprobrious and offensive terms. I would have retired immediately, but waited for J. S. G., who stood in momentary expectation of leaving. After some time, we withdrew; and for myself I can say, with no feelings but those of pity and kindness for the man who had given me a reception so strange and unexpected.

I have related the facts as they occurred, not from a desire to retaliate, nor to awaken either sympathy for myself or hatred towards George F. White, but because they form an essential part of the history of the transaction with which they are so intimately connected.

During the interview, he produced the evidence on which he relied to prove that the whole body of abolitionists were blasphemers. And what does the reader suppose it was? Surely, he will say, it could not have

been any thing less than some important official document, containing an authorized and well known exposition of the principles of the accused. Will it be believed, that it was nothing more than a *resolution* of the *Junior Anti-Slavery Society of Philadelphia*—a Society composed principally of *minors*, and *members, too, of the Society of Friends*? Astonishing as it may seem, it is nevertheless true! Here is the resolution, with which he declared he was ready to meet all the abolitionists in the United States! It was adopted Dec. 1839.

*"Resolved, That as we believe the only hope for the slave is in the Anti-Slavery Societies, the abolitionists of the present day must contribute more liberally of their funds, if they expect to accomplish their most glorious object—the liberation from their chains of three millions of their fellow countrymen."**

Admitting, for the sake of the argument, (what is not true,) that this resolution is of a blasphemous character, in what language shall I express the monstrous injustice of holding the whole body of abolitionists responsible for its phraseology, and making it the basis whereon to rest a charge of "**FLAT BLASPHEMY**" against thousands of people who never saw nor heard of it, and whose lives are "**unimpeachable**" witnesses of their firm reliance upon that God, in obedience to whose requisitions they are

* I ought, perhaps, to state, that G. F. W. also spoke of a similar resolution, or sentiment, which, he said, had been adopted by one of the Anti-Slavery Conventions of American Women, but of which he was unable, *then*, to furnish a copy, although he said he could do so in a short time, if it was desired. I have since read the proceedings of all those Conventions with great care, but have found nothing of the kind. I *did* find, however, among a multitude of similar acknowledgments of dependence on Divine aid, the following :

"Resolved, That we acknowledge, with heartfelt gratitude, the protection afforded us by our Heavenly Father, during the sittings of this Convention; and that we feel sensible, that it is through the assistance of his Spirit we have been enabled to conduct our deliberations with so much profit and harmony."

"Resolved, That, as women professing Christianity, we will, THROUGH CHRIST STRENGTHENING US, never hide the truth of God in relation to the subject of slavery, though, by maintaining that truth, we should be made partakers in the sufferings of those who, through faith, endured bonds and imprisonment, not accepting deliverance."

These resolutions indicate the character of the women whom a minister of the Society of Friends, in the nineteenth century, denounces as "**blasphemers!**" And this, too, notwithstanding a large number, perhaps a majority of them, are members of that Society.

“crying aloud” against the bloody system of oppression, which curses and pollutes our land! If there is any truth, justice, or honesty, in thus accusing the whole body of abolitionists, then it would be equally true, equally just, equally honest, to charge with blasphemy the whole body of Friends; for a very large proportion, perhaps a majority, of those who adopted the resolution, are members, in good standing, of that Society! If the accusers, (for G. F. W. does not stand alone,) really believe their own charge to be true, why do they not proceed against the transgressors agreeably to the discipline? Why, instead of thrusting his charges at some of the most exemplary members of the Society, from behind the entrenchment of the preachers’ gallery, where he knows he cannot be contradicted without a breach of order, does not George F. White arraign them before a tribunal where their guilt may be fairly proved, or their innocence clearly demonstrated? What would be thought of me, if, believing—yea, *knowing*—these charges to be false, I should assert, before a public assembly, that the whole body of Friends, in every part of the country, are responsible for them? And will it be pretended that the mass of abolitionists are any more responsible for the act of one local society, than are Friends for the statements made by a man whose ministry they sanction? But, I should greatly wrong thousands of Friends, if I were to intimate that these denunciations met with their approval—nay, that they do *not* meet with their decided condemnation. I am persuaded, that even in this city, the number of Friends is exceedingly small who would openly say that they approve of them, while some of the most active members of the Society, (and those, too, who have never joined anti-slavery associations,) are exceedingly tried in their minds in consequence of them. Friends must measure their own responsibility for charges made by a minister who acts under the official approbation of the Society. It is a matter which they must settle with their own consciences, and with Him who has said, “THOU SHALT NOT RAISE A FALSE REPORT.”

The resolution, I admit, is unguarded in its phraseology. It were better if it read—“the only hope for the slave is, *under God*, in the anti-slavery societies.” Such

is the only fair and candid construction which can be put upon it, by any person who is acquainted with the character and professions of those who adopted it.* There are some men, however, who, in their anxiety to carry a point, can

—— “Construe things, *after their fashion,*
Clean from the purpose of the things themselves.”

With such it is in vain to reason ; and none others will need argument in a case so plain.

What will the reader say, when he is assured, that in the very paper from which the above resolution was taken, and in a Report issued by the same Society, was the following passage, clearly evincing that those who adopted it looked for the blessing of God upon their humble, though faithful labors ?

“Act thy part well, then, even though it be lowly. It is not the part, but the manner in which it is filled, that constitutes the merit. *Find thy appropriate place,* and then battle manfully. *Above all, despair not, for despair is not of God, but of the father of lies. Doubt not the wisdom and power of the great Commander, but do his bidding.*”

In my remarks at the Rose-street meeting, I challenged an examination of the official documents of the abolitionists, in proof of their reliance upon God to give them strength for the conflict with oppression, and to crown their labors with success. There is not a tract or publication of any sort, which they have ever issued, that does not abound with evidences of their faith in the DIVINE ARM. To present all the testimony on this point, which their writings afford, would be to reprint nearly all the authorized expositions of their principles and objects. As *specimens* of what I might offer, if it were necessary, I annex a few passages.

The Convention which formed the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1833, issued a “Declaration of Sentiments,” which has been received by abolitionists from that

* It is a coincidence worth mentioning, that a distinguished minister of the Society of Friends recently used, in a letter, language of exactly the same import, in relation to the Indians,—avowing his belief that their “only hope” is in that Society ! Of course, he spoke of the Society as an *instrumentality* in the hands of God, whose blessing upon its efforts is the foundation of the hope alluded to.

day to the present, as an authentic exposition of their principles and purposes. In it is the following language :

"OUR TRUST FOR VICTORY IS SOLELY IN GOD.—We may be personally defeated, but our *principles* never. . . . Submitting this Declaration to the candid examination of the people of this country, and of the friends of liberty throughout the world, we hereby affix our signatures to it ; pledging ourselves that, *under the guidance and by the help of Almighty God*, we will do all that in us lies consistently with this declaration of our principles, to overthrow the most execrable system of slavery that has ever been witnessed upon earth. . . . come what may to our persons, our interests, or our reputations—whether we live to witness the triumph of Liberty, Justice, and Humanity, or perish untimely as martyrs in this great, benevolent, and holy cause."

The "Declaration of Sentiments" adopted by the abolitionists of Ohio, contains the following passage :

"For success in this sacred enterprise, *we cease from man, and LOOK TO GOD ALONE*. In him is everlasting strength, with him the residue of the Spirit and plenteous redemption. . . . *His wisdom is our guide, his power our defence, his truth our weapon, his Spirit our comforter, his promise the anchor of our soul, his approval our exceeding great reward, and his blessing upon our past labors a sure presage of the glory to be revealed in the triumphs of a redemption which already draweth nigh.*"

The New-York State Society, in an address issued at its formation in 1835, said :

"In prosecuting the objects, appropriate to our character, as abolitionists, *let us devote ourselves to the service, and rely on the resources of Jehovah, as the God of the oppressed*. Any reliance merely human, must prove vain and deceptive. . . . We cannot confide in *ourselves*. With cunning to seduce ; and malignity to threaten ; and power to intimidate us, our foes will leave no stratagem or expedient untried, to entangle and overpower us. Woe to the man, who in such a cause as ours, may dare to lean to his own understanding ! Something more he will need than a hot head, or stiff neck, or stout will, to bear him honorably through such a conflict as awaits us. *The arm of God alone has strength to sustain the shock, to which we are exposed*. And while in subserving the cause of freedom, *we are for God*, we may rest assured, that *He will be with us* in supporting a cause so dear and sacred. . . . And let us prayerfully expect, that the Spirit and the Providence of God will make our doctrines and our doings efficacious. Thus guided, cheered and sustained, we shall be wise in wisdom, and strong in power, infinitely above our own ; the wisdom and the power of God."

If I had space I might quote similar passages from the documents of every State Society in the land. But, let us come to the city of New-York, the residence of the man who has charged the abolitionists with blasphemously denying their dependence upon God. In an address issu-

ed by the City Society, in 1833, I find the following language :

"The right, and the God of right, are with us. *Relying upon his arm for support and guidance, and imploring his blessing for success,* we address ourselves to our work, unangered and unawed, and invite the support and aid of our fellow citizens, under the firm and settled assurance, that, whatever of labor or obloquy it may cost the friends of abolition, it is the cause of God and our country, and will succeed."

Having submitted this testimony from the official documents of abolitionists, I leave the reader to judge for himself whether I was not fully justified in repelling, in the manner I did, the charge brought against them. If G. F. W. had simply stated, that the *Philadelphia Junior Society* had adopted a resolution, which, if taken literally, involved "blasphemy," I should not have deemed it my province to contradict him ; but I could not, in conscience, listen to a sweeping charge of that kind, against the whole body of abolitionists, without protesting against it as false and cruel.

I am sure that *Friends* generally will not be less astonished than I was at George F. White's denial of the truth of my statement, that the early founders of the Society often violated the laws of the land by speaking in the meetings of other denominations. Above all, they must be sensible of the gross injustice of accusing me of falsehood for incidentally alluding, under the circumstances in which I was placed, to a fact which I had often heard mentioned by leading members of the Society, and which had never, to my knowledge, been denied.—The fact that I made the statement in a public meeting of *Friends*, who would have it in their power to detect and expose it, if untrue, would be quite sufficient, in the estimation of every candid mind, to exonerate me from the charge of willful misrepresentation, even if I *had* gone further than the truth would bear me out. *Friends*, well acquainted with the history of the Society, however, assure me that I was right ; and now, after an examination of authorities, that which at first was only an *impression* upon my mind has given place to a well-settled conviction that I stated nothing more than a simple truth, which it must require great ignorance or presumption to deny.

I have before me the third London edition of the Journal of George Fox, in which I find many facts to corroborate my statement. I will refer to a few of them.

On p. 16, George Fox says—

"I was moved to go to several courts and steeple-houses, at Mansfield and other places, to warn them to *leave off oppression*," &c. [not to denounce as "blasphemers" and "hypocrites" those who were striving, in the fear of God, to put an end to oppression!]

Again, p. 24—

"As I went towards Nottingham, on a first day, in the morning, . . . I espied the great steeple-house, and the Lord said unto me, 'Thou must go cry against yonder great idol, and against the worshippers therein,'"

He accordingly went to the house, and interrupted the preacher in the midst of his discourse; after describing which, he adds:

"As I spake thus amongst them, the officers came, took me away, and put me into a nasty, stinking prison. . . . At night, they took me before the mayor, aldermen, and sheriffs of the town. . . . After some discourse between them and me, they sent me back to prison."

Again, p. 26—

"While I was at Mansfield Woodhouse, I was moved to go to the steeple house, and declare the truth to the priest and people. But the people fell upon me in great rage, struck me down, and almost stifled me. I was cruelly beaten and bruised by them, with their hands, bibles, and sticks. Then they haled me out, though I was hardly able to stand, and put me into the stocks. . . . After some time, they had me before the magistrates," &c.

Again, p. 28—

"I went to Chesterfield, where one Britland was priest. . . . I was moved to speak to him and the people, in the great love of God. . . . But they had me before the mayor, and threatened to send me, with some others, to the house of correction; and kept us in custody till it was late in the night. Then the officers and the watchmen put us out of the town, leaving us to shift as we could."

Speaking of a visit to Derby, (p. 29,) he says:

"There was to be a great lecture there that day, and many officers of the army, priests and preachers, were to be there, and a colonel that was a preacher. Then was I moved of the Lord to go up to them.—When they had done, I spake to them what the Lord commanded me; and they were pretty quiet. But there came an officer, and took me by the hand, and said I must go before the magistrates, and the other two that were with me."

Again, (p. 63,) speaking of his visit to the "steeple-

house at Tickhill, where he began to address the people, he says—

"They immediately fell upon me; the clerk up with his bible, as I was speaking, 'struck me on the face with it, so that my face gushed out with blood; and I bled exceedingly in the steeple-house.' The people cried, 'Let us have him out of the church.' When they had got me out, they beat me exceedingly, threw me down, and turned me over a hedge."

Again, p. 75—

"I heard of a great meeting the priests were to have at Ulverston, on a lecture day. I went to it, and into the steeple-house, in the dread and power of the Lord. When the priest had done, I spoke among them the word of the Lord."

These are but a few of the cases to which I might refer in the Journal of George Fox, but they are amply sufficient to "clear my skirts" of the charge of falsehood for saying what I did in the Rose-street meeting. I may add, also, that several cases of a similar character, which occurred soon after the settlement of Friends in this country, are on record; and in Besse's "Sufferings of the Quakers," (vol. 1, p. 11,) it is said:

"In this and the foregoing year, (1655-6,) Joseph Cole, Dorothy Waugh, George Adamson, Hannah Mills, Thomas Curtis and Anne his wife, were imprisoned at *several times*, for offering to speak, by way of Christian exhortation, to the priest and people, when assembled in their place for public worship at Reading."

Will it be said, that the conduct of these "early founders" of the Society was not contrary to law? One individual has told me that they had a legal right to speak, because they were *taxed*! It is a sufficient answer to this to say, that they uniformly *refused* to pay tithes, and therefore had no right on that score; but, even if they had paid all that the law demanded, and thereby acquired the right alluded to, in the parishes where they resided, it is absurd to suppose that they thus acquired a general license to enter and address the meetings of all denominations, in every part of the country, at their pleasure.

George Fox and his associates evidently had very different views of the obligations of Christianity, and the effects produced by its promulgation, from those which too extensively prevail in the Society of Friends at the present day. They did not understand the modern way

of "*getting into the quiet.*" Their fear of "excitement" was not an overmatch for their Christian fidelity in proclaiming unpopular truth; their "waiting" was not for a time when that truth would cease to agitate and inflame the minds of those who were determined to reject it. Their philosophy of reform was drawn from the teachings and example of Him, who came "not to send peace on the earth but a sword," and who was put to death because he would not be "quiet" while he saw the world lying in wickedness around him. They had not a factitious and honorable reputation, derived from the toils and sacrifices of an ancestry, whose principles they professed, while they had not the self-denial to practice them. They did not make it their highest boast that a selfish and ungodly generation spoke well of them; but they rejoiced when their names were cast out as evil, and that they were counted worthy to suffer persecution for Christ's sake. They were often thrown into prison as "blasphemers" and "disturbers of the peace," but these devices of the enemy of all righteousness were as oil to the flame of their zeal. And why were they thus cruelly persecuted? For the same reason that Christian Reformers have been persecuted in every age—they bore a faithful and uncompromising testimony against the popular sins of the time in which they lived. They dealt not with the past, but with THE PRESENT. They did not content themselves with attacking those iniquities which they could denounce with safety to their persons and reputations, nor with uttering those truths which the world, in consequence of the fidelity of their forefathers, had learned to tolerate. Their warfare was aggressive, and as they went forth in the strength of God, tyranny and falsehood stood pale and trembling before them, or fled at their approach. What agitations, what conflicts, what commotions, what excitements, did they produce! The same faithfulness in exposing the popular vices of the present day has produced similar results; and the present exemption of the Society of Friends, as well as of other religious denominations, from persecution, is owing, not more to the increase of light and knowledge, than to their want of fidelity to Truth.

OLIVER JOHNSON.